DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 279 EA 029 024

AUTHOR Ford, Barbara
TITLE Using the Readiness Five Phase Plan To Facilitate the School Development Program and the Improvement of School Climate.
PUB DATE 1997-03-00
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Check Lists; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Development; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Development; Rating Scales; School Effectiveness; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS California (San Francisco Bay Area)

ABSTRACT

The Bay Area Comer Development Program's "Readiness Five Phase Plan" was developed to bring the school sites involved in the Bay Area School Development Program (SDP) closer to the mission and goals of the program. To achieve this, a readiness assessment and checklists are used to determine if a site is ready to engage in the program. An analysis of the checklists is provided. Using the checklists, data from four schools were collected and compared. Results indicate that the checklists can be used by all four schools to focus on areas needed to proceed through the SDP and to improve school climate. Two of the schools showed positive movement in their readiness to engage in the change process, and after they entered into the SDP these schools indicated readiness to proceed through the SDP. The other two schools showed varying degrees of readiness to progress through SDP. All the schools reported beginning levels on the School-Wide Discipline Checklists, indicating an area needing continued focus and development. It is recommended that all schools should complete checklists annually and at the same time each year. Data should be collected systematically with complete demographic information included. Likewise, all adult stakeholders should complete checklists. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 279

Using the Readiness Five Phase Plan to Facilitate the School Development Program and the Improvement of School Climate

by

Barbara Ford, San Francisco State University

Presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, Chicago, Illinois

March 26, 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Ford
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 029024

The Bay Area Comer School Development Program's *Readiness Five Phase Plan* (Hill Stepney et. al., 1996) is an instrument developed collaboratively by Comer District Facilitators from San Francisco, Ravenswood, Oakland and a University Facilitator to bring the school sites involved in the Bay Area School Development Program closer to the mission and goals of the program. Schools wanting to adopt the Comer Model (Comer, 1980: Comer, Haynes, Joyner, and Ben Avie, 1996) are asked to complete the Readiness Assessment, School-Wide Discipline Checklist, and the Educational Environment Checklist. The readiness assessment and checklists are then used to determine if a site is ready to engage in the School Development Program, and are able to move through the five phases and the phases are similar to the "Life Cycle Stages" identified by the School Development Program (SDP), developed by the Yale Child Study, Yale University .

Along with school sites assessing themselves in an ongoing manner they are also asked to use the Readiness Five Phase Plan as a guide for their school's development. The readiness assessment and the checklist were designed to be used as baseline data and revisited at least annually by stakeholders.

This preliminary study sought to find out "How can *the Readiness Five Phase Plan* be used to Facilitate the School Development Program and the Improvement of School Climate?"

Methodology

Checklists' data from four schools involved in the Bay Area Comer School Development Program were collected and compared. School A began the School Development Program in Fall, 1994, School B began in Fall, 1995, and School C and D both began the process in 1991 and were original Comer schools in the Bay Area.

School A has had some teacher transiency since beginning the process. It has had the same principal who had been at the school two years prior to beginning the SDP. School B has also had some teacher transiency and had their principal for two years before starting the SDP. Schools C had high teacher turnover and a new principal when completing the checklists at the beginning of the school year. School D had some teacher transiency and the same principal since beginning SDP in 1991.

Schools A and B collected two sets of data. Schools A and B collected the first set when they were beginning their school's readiness

and the second when they were moving through setting the stage and initiating site implementation, Phases I and II.

Schools C and D reported only one set of data. School C's data was collected in their third year of implementation, but after a change of principal and a high turnover of teachers. School D also collected data in its third implementation year. Schools C surveyed only teachers and administrators. School A, B, D surveyed certificate, classified, and school volunteers.

All surveys were given and collected during faculty and staff meetings. They were distributed and collected by site facilitators or district facilitators. Summary data was then compiled.

The instrument had gone through revision between first and second administration with School A. Schools B and D used a later revision of the instrument. The response items for the Readiness Checklist were adjusted so that they could be compared. Response choices on the first Readiness Assessment were: yes or no for each item. Response choices for the revised Readiness Assessment Checklist, the Educational Environment Checklist and the School-wide Discipline Checklist were: no, beginning, developing, or exemplary.

Data from School A and School B were collected during the first and second year as they began the SDP process. School C and School D collected data during their third year.

Schools were not required to use the instrument but were advised to have all adult stakeholders to complete the checklist annually. The assessment of phases was to be completed by each School's Planning and Management Team.

Schools A, B, and D collected and reported checklist data from various adult stakeholders. School C reported checklist data from certificated staff only. Schools then had district facilitators tally data. Facilitators gave schools summaries. Schools then decided if follow-up, intervention, or changes were needed as indicated by the results. Facilitators also made suggestions to schools as to what actions should be taken or what areas needed further development.

Percentage of yes responses on the Readiness Assessment were calculated and mean scores for responses on the Educational Environment and School-wide Discipline Checklists were determined. This data was then compared to see what differences appeared within Schools A and B and between the two schools. Schools C and D were compared to see differences between schools.

Results

Responses from the Readiness Assessment Checklist, as indicated in Table 1, revealed that School C had much lower percentages of yes than the other schools on

Table 1 Readiness Checklists Results for Schools

SCHOOL	A			B			C	D
Item from RFFP	%Yes A	%Yes A	Diff-A	%Yes B	%Yes B	Diff-B	%Yes C	%Yes D
	n=34	n=24		n=25	n=20		n=16	n=38
1. ready to participate	90.6	95.8	+5.8	92	90	- 2	13	87
2. Need shared vision	87.5	95.8	+8.3	84	90	+6	38	87
3. Nine Elements introduced	90.6	95.8	+5.8	64	75	+11	63	71
4. Professional growth: a. meeting management	71.9	79.2	+7.3	68	70	+2	38	63
b. Team building	81.3	83.3	+2.0	56	85	+29	44	79
c. Consensus	90.6	87.5	-3.1	72	80	+8	44	78
d. Conflict resolution	90.6	91.7	+1.1	68	75	+7	31	61
e. Social skills	78.1	83.3	+5.2	56	80	+24	19	55
f. Cultural implications	78.1	70.8	-7.3	60	75	+15	25	63
g. Cooperative Learning	90.6	83.3	-7.3	72	80	+8	38	84
h. Curr frameworks	90.6	83.3	-7.3	72	75	+3	25	71
I. State Reform Docs	90.6	87.5	-3.1	92	70	-22	13	50
j. Auth Assessment	78.1	83.3	+5.2	84	75	- 9	25	52
k. Effective Schools Res	78.1	83.3	+5.2	40	60	+20	06	45
Fits into district plan	84.1	91.7	+7.6	88	75	-13	69	74
6. SW discipline assessed	87.5	91.7	+4.2	96	85	-11	31	61
7. Ed Environ assessed	87.5	91.7	+4.2	68	65	- 3	38	61
8. Applied for the SDP	81.3	79.2	-2.1	28	40	+12	13	50
9. Other documents	81.3	75.0	-6.3	44	55	+11	50	45
10. Central Office sign-off	81.3	75.0	-6.3	04	35	+31	13	24

all items. Most items were lower for School D than those for Schools A and B. Schools A and B showed both gains and losses in percentage of yes responses. School A had 12 items that showed gains and eight items that decrease in percentage of yes responses. School B had 11 items showing gains and 9 showing losses.

Schools A, B, and D had higher mean scores than School C on most items on the Educational Environment Checklist (Table 2). Schools A and B had most mean scores increase in the second administration. All item means reported for School A were 2.0 or above indicating that all these areas are developing whereas School C item means are < 2.0 indicating a beginning stage for all items.

Table 3 shows mean scores for all schools on the School-Wide Discipline Checklist. Most mean responses for all four schools on the School-Wide Discipline Checklist were <2.0, indicating these schools are at the beginning stage of each item. Several items for school A showed a decrease mean score for the second administration.

Table 2

Educational Environment Checklist Results

SCHOOL	A	A	B	B	C	D
Item	m1	m2	m1	m2	m	m
	n=34	n=24	n=25	n=20	n=16	n=39
1.Educational environment plan	1.59	2.40	2.50	1.82	1.29	1.62
2.Inside is clean and pleasant.	2.41	2.61	1.70	2.20	1.27	2.58
3.The outside is clean and pleasant.	2.21	2.52	1.60	2.00	1.27	2.34
4.The inside of our school smells pleasant.	2.24	2.55	1.73	2.25	1.36	2.43
5.The outside of our school smells pleasant.	2.12	2.43	1.86	2.10	1.23	2.45
6.There is a plan to address graffiti	1.82	2.43	1.76	2.64	1.30	2.28
7.Students and staff take pride in our school	2.03	2.14	1.91	1. 61	1.46	2.14
8.A sense of community within our school.	1.72	2.00	2.00	1.95	1.54	1.92
9.Student work and/or achievements displayed attractively	2.24	2.00	2.04	2.05	1.73	2.29
10.A reward system in place	2.24	2.30	1.87	1.81	1.33	1.68
11. Active educational environment team	1.76	2.17	1.55	1.45	1.50	1.81
12.Our school is viewed as a haven	1.56	2.24	1.73	1.50	1.27	1.74

Table 2

School Wide Discipline Checklist Results

SCHOOL	A	A	B	B	C	D
Item	m1	m2	m1	m2	m	m
	n=34	n=24	n=25	n=20	n=16	n=39
1.Known school-wide discipline (SWD) policy	2.32	1.94	1.92	1.83	1.64	1.91
2.Classroom management system in place	2.13	2.06	1.83	1.71	1.31	1.88
3.Students actively involved in the development of (SWD) policy.	1.70	1.94	1.30	1.46	1.27	1.67
4.Expectations, rules, and consequences clear to all students.	2.26	2.24	1.88	1.89	1.42	2.00
5.Rules are consistently and fairly enforced	1.93	2.00	2.13	1.81	1.30	1.37
6.Consequences fair, clearly articulated, and enforced.	1.94	2.00	2.00	1.67	1.27	1.67
7.Order and discipline established and internalized	1.77	1.82	1.82	1.78	NR	1.90
8.Adults responsible for behavior of all students.	1.83	2.00	2.00	2.11	1.82	1.88
9.Adults respect the students.	2.17	2.12	2.12	2.25	1.69	2.00
10.Students respect the adults.	1.77	1.88	1.88	2.11	2.62	1.67

Conclusions

1. The Readiness, Educational Environment and School-wide Discipline Checklists of the *Readiness Five Phase Plan* can be used by both schools and the Bay Area Comer School Development Program partnership to focus on areas needed to proceed through the School Development Program (SDP) and to improve school climate.
2. Schools A and B showed positive movement in their readiness to engage in the change process indicating that these schools were ready to enter into the School Development Program (SDP)
3. After entering into the SDP and the second administration of the Readiness Checklist, Schools A and B most areas indicated readiness to proceed through in the SDP.
4. School C showed little evidence of readiness to proceed through the SDP.
5. School D showed some readiness to proceed through SDP.
6. Schools A, B, and D indicated a developing level of favorable conditions on the Educational Environment Checklist which indicates a developing level of conditions leading to positive school climate.
7. In their third year School C reported a low beginning level of favorable conditions on the Educational Environment Checklist indicating a lack of progress to positive school climate.

8. All schools reported beginning levels on the School-wide Discipline Checklists indicating an area needing continued focus and development to improve school climate.

Recommendations

1. All schools should complete checklists annually and at the same time each year.
2. Schools should not complete checklists until the third month of school.
3. Data should be collected systematically with complete demographic information included.
4. All adult stakeholders should complete checklists.
5. SPMT's should complete a self assessment of phase at about the same time as checklists.
6. Schools and facilitators should submit a reflection report.

References

Comer, J. P. (1980, 1993). School Power: Implications of an Internvention Program. New York:The Free Press.

Comer, J. P., Haynes, N. M., Joyner, E. T., and Ben-Avie, M. (Eds.), (1986). Rallying the Whole Village: The Comer Process for Reforming Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hill-Stepney, M. T., Booker, E., Duff, M., Peeks, Y. and Stockey, D. (1996). The Bay Area School Development (Comer) Readiness and Five Phase Plan.

Abstract

This study sought to find out how the "Readiness Five Phase Plan," (1996) can facilitate the Comer School Development Program (SDP) and the improvement of school climate. Four schools from the Bay Area School Development Program were studied. The "Readiness Five Phase Plan" was developed to help guide schools through school development process and as an instrument schools can use to self assess through this process. Two schools reported checklist data for first and second years in the process. The two schools who had been in process for three years and reported one set had very different results. It was concluded that: *The Readiness Five Phase Plan* can be used by both the schools and the Bay Area Comer School Development Program partnership to focus on areas needed to proceed through the School Development Program (SDP), and to improve school climate; schools A and B were ready to proceed through SDP; School D showed some readiness to proceed; School C showed little evidence of readiness: Schools A, B, and D were developing their educational environment and moving towards improved school climate; and all schools were at the beginnings stages of positive school-wide discipline efforts.